



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,851	12/01/2003	Robert N.C. Broberg III	03-1458/L13.12-0245	2165
7590	10/16/2007			EXAMINER
Leo J. Peters LSI Logic Corporation MS D-106 1621 Barber Lane Milpitas, CA 95035				TECKLU, ISAAC TUKU
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2192	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,851	BROBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isaac T. Tecklu	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/07/2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 08/07/2007.
2. Claims 1 and 10-14 have been amended.
3. Claim 12 has been cancelled.
4. Claims 1-11 and 13-20 have been reexamined.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dalton et al. (US 6,981,017 B1), hereinafter Dalton.

As per claim 1 (Currently Amended), Dalton discloses a process of abstracting file paths for a plurality of design files in a computer readable language comprising steps of (e.g. FIG. 1 and related text):

a) generating a inputting at least one description file defining file paths to the design files in a first environment (col. 5: 45-55 “... each input file that contains a reference to a directory path in the previous design system ... “ and e.g. FIG. 1, 100, 102 and FIG. 3A, 300 and related text);

b) parsing a directory structure on the system to locate the description file to identify file paths to the description file and each of the design files (col. 4: 20-30 "... directory name is parsed ... identifies a relationship for respective line ..." and e.g. FIG. 2, 206 and FIG. 3A, 302 and related text); and

c) generating an index correlating each description file and its respective file path for the first environment (col. 4: 35-45 "... generating mapping file ..." and e.g. FIG. 1,106 and 108 and related text).

As per claim 2, Dalton discloses the process of claim 1, wherein step (b) comprises:

b1) defining a directory of description files defining file paths in the first environment (col. 2: 50-65 "... defines .. directory structure ..." and col. 5: 45-55 "... each input file that contains a reference to a directory path in the previous design system ... "), and

b2) parsing the directory (e.g. FIG. 2, 206 and related text).

As per claim 3, Dalton discloses the process of claim 2, further comprises: d) defining a file path in a second environment for each description file (col. 2:1-10 "... file paths in the ASIC design system ..."), e) applying the index to the file paths in the second environment to define full file paths for each design file through the first and second environments (col. 4: 35-45 "... generating mapping file ..." and e.g. FIG. 1,106 and 108 and related text), and f) applying the design files to the second environment using the full file paths (e.g. FIG. 2, 202-208 and related text).

As per claim 4, Dalton discloses the process of claim 3, further comprising: g) before step f), constructing a list containing design file names and respective full paths through the first and second environments (col. 2: 35-45 "... lines are sorted into an ordered list based ..."e.g. FIG. 3A, 308 and related text).

As per claim 5, Dalton discloses the process of claim 3, wherein step e) comprises: combining file paths in the index with respective file paths in the second environment (col. 4: 35-45 "... generating mapping file ... combine the process ...").

As per claim 6, Dalton discloses the process of claim 1, further comprises: d) defining a file path in a second environment for each description file (col. 2:1-10 "... file paths in the ASIC design system ..."), e) applying the index to the file paths in the second environment to define full file paths for each design file through the first and second environments (col. 4: 35-45 "... generating mapping file ..." and e.g. FIG. 1,106 and 108 and related text), and f) applying the design files to the second environment using the full file paths (col. 4: 35-45 "... generating mapping file ... combine the process ...").

As per claim 7, Dalton discloses the process of claim 6, further comprising g) before step f), constructing a list containing design file names and respective full paths through the first and second environments (col. 2: 35-45 "... lines are sorted into an ordered list based ..." e.g. FIG. 3A, 308 and related text).

As per claim 8, Dalton discloses the process of claim 6, wherein step e) comprises: combining file paths in the index with respective file paths in the second environment (col. 4: 35-45 "... generating mapping file ... combine the process ...").

As per claim 9, Dalton discloses the process of claim 8, wherein the combining step comprises concatenating the respective file paths (col. 3: 35-45 "... netlists are generated ...").

As per claim 10 (Currently Amended), this is the process for applying a design file version of the claimed process discussed above (Claims 1 and 3), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 11 (Currently Amended), this is the process for applying design file version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 4), wherein all claim limitations have been

addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 13 (Currently Amended, this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 1), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 14 (Currently Amended), this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 2), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 15, this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 3), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 16, this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 4), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 17, this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 5), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 18, this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 6), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 19, this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 7), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

*Response to Arguments*

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 13-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See Dalton, art made of record.

*Conclusion*

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac T. Tecklu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7957. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:300A - 8:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Isaac Tecklu  
Art Unit 2192

  
TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER